In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

19

To T. Ganesan

52

AGHORAŚIVĀCĀRYA : AUTHOR OF THE PARĀRTHANITYAPŪJĀVIDHI ?

GINNI ISHIMATSU

Aghoraśivācārya, the Śaiva Siddhāntin preceptor who lived in Chidambaram during the twelfth cent. A.D., was the author of many works on Śaiva ritual and doctrine.[1] According to the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* about twenty works are attributed to this important teacher. In this essay, I argue that one of these texts, a manual of temple ritual called the *Parārthanityapūjāvidhi* ('Rules for daily worship for the sake of others', hereafter *PNPV*), is very likely not one of Aghoraśiva's own writings, but rather a late work by someone else. If correct, this hypothesis will help scholars to determine more precisely than now which works by this celebrated author are authentic and will deepen our understanding of the historial development of Śaiva Siddhantic ritual.

Authentic works by Aghoraśiva

In order to lay the groundwork for a discussion of the *PNPV*'s authorship, I will summarise some of the characteristics of Aghoraśiva's genuine works. Not in dispute are the famous ritual manual known as the *Kriyākramadyotikā* ('Light on ritual procedures'), the *Mṛgendravṛttidīpikā*, a sub-commentary on the *Mṛgendrāgama*; or his commentaries on six of the philosophical treatises of the *Aṣṭaprakaraṇa*, namely, his sub-commentary on Bhoja's *Tattvaprakāśa*, his commentaries on Sadyojyoti's *Tattvasamgraha*, *Tattvatrayanirṇaya*, and *Bhogakārikā*, his commentary on the *Nādakārikā* of Rāmakaṇṭha II, and his *Ratnatrayollekhinī*, a commentary on Śrīkaṇṭha's *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā*. In most of these works,

1. The most recent and complete account of Aghoraśivācārya's life is Richard H. Davis's 'Aghoraśiva's Background', Dr. S.S. Janaki Felicitation Volume, *The Journal of Oriental Research* (*Madras*) 56-62 (1992), pp. 367-78.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Aghoraśiva provides first-person references to himself and his own writings. Among five of these commentaries, seventeen direct references to his *Mṛgendravṛttidīpikā* are found. In each of these cases, he mentions the latter text in order to refer readers to technical or philosophical arguments that he has already discussed there. Such references typically come at the end of a discussion of a particular point and are nearly formulaic in their phrasing. In his *Ratnatrayollekhinī*, for instance, he writes, 'I have established [such-and-such a point] in detail in the *Mṛgendravṛttidīpikā*; hence, it should be understood [as written there].'[2] Similar statements appear in his other commentaries too. Together, these kinds of statements constitute, strong forms of internal evidence that the works in question are Aghoraśiva's own.

In additon to referring to the *Mṛgendravṛttidīpikā*, Aghoraśiva's *Aṣṭaprakaraṇa* commentaries mention one another. For example, in the *Ratnatrayollekhinī* the author twice mentions his commentary on the *Tattvaprakāśa*.[3] His commentary on the *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* also refers the reader to his *Tattvasamgraha* commentary.[4] Similarly, the latter text refers twice to the *Tattvaprakāśavṛtti* and once to the *Ratnatrayollekhinī*.[5] Besides again confirming the authenticity of these works, this sort of internal evidence helps us determine the relative chronology of some of Aghoraśiva's major works and also provides a sense of his commentarial style.

---

2. Vrajavallabha Dvivedi, ed., *Aṣṭaprakaraṇam*, Sampurnananda Sanskrit University, Varanasi, 1988, p. 149: *ityādi vistareṇa sādhitam asmābhir mṛgendravṛttidīpikāyām iti tata evāvadhāryam*. For the other direct references to the *Mṛgendravṛttidīpikā* in this collection, see pp. 7, 48, 79, 100. 116, 125 (two references), 141, 145, 150, 155, 201, 206, 218, 220, 229.

   Also all the references from the other commentaries of Aghoraśiva are to this same edition.

3. For example, the gloss on v. 49 (p.157) reads : *proktam cāsmābhis tattvaprakāśavṛttau* : see also p. 172 (after v.142).

4. Gloss on v.8 (p. 139) *etac ca vistareṇoktam asmābhis tattvasamgrahalaghuṭīkāyām*

5. *Ibid.*, p. 125 - 26, 131.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Another characteristic of Aghoraśiva's style of writing appears in his use of quotations. In keeping with the conventions of the literature, as commentator he quotes generously from the Āgamas and writings by past Śaiva teachers in order to demonstrate that his interpretations are based firmly on authoritative texts. In contrast, he almost never quotes directly from his own works. In *paddhati* and commentarial literature generally, this restraint is typical. In fact, after Aghoraśiva refers to one of his writings, he will sometimes add, " I will not write about this matter here for fear of [excessively] lengthening this text"[6] (*granthavistarabhayāt*).

Given the enormity of his literary output, it is noteworthy that while Aghoraśiva refers to his own compositions fairly frequently in his commentaries, to the best of my knowledge, he quotes from his own texts in only two places. One quote appears in his sub-commentary on the *Mṛgendrāgama*, where he writes, "I myself have declared in the *Pāṣaṇḍāpajaya* ["Defeat of the Heretics"], 'When Śiva's majesty has been explained by Revelation, Tradition, the Purāṇas, excellent ascetics and others, how can men still remain doubtful, [regarding such-and-such a subject] ?"[7] This quote serves at once as a rhetorical question, praise of Śiva's greatness, and a dismissal of opponents' arguments. As such, it poses no real problem for my assertion that Aghoraśiva reserves quotations for authoritative texts.

But in the second quote from his *Pāṣaṇḍāpajaya*, Aghoraśiva does seem to claim some kind of authority for his own views. At the end of his gloss on the *Mṛgendra* commentator's argument that Śiva is, by the logic of inference, the cause of the creation, maintenance, etc., of the

---

6. Cf. his gloss on vv. 30-1 (p. 145) in the *Tattvatrayanirṇayavṛtti* : *eṣa ca malavicāro 'smābhir mṛgendravṛttidīpikāyām vistareṇa darśita iti tata evāvadheyaḥ| granthavistarabhayāt tu nātra likhyate* || Similarly, p. 165 (*Ratnatrayollekhinī*, gloss on vv. 91-2) p. 218 (*Bhogakārikāvṛtti* on v. 64)

7. End of Aghoraśiva's gloss on Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha's *vṛtti* on the *Mṛgendrāgama*, Vidyāpāda, Ch. 5 (Pañcakṛtyaprakaraṇa), verse 18. My paraphrase of Michel Hulin, trans., *Mṛgendrāgama : sections de la doctrine et du yoga*, Institut Francais d'Indologie Pondicherry, 1980 p. 156.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

world, he adds: "I have declared in my *Pāśaṇḍāpajaya*: 'An aggregation [of parts] goes with an effect [i.e., the world]; likewise, it is established that an effect is in a relationship of universal concordance with an agent'."[8] In his role as sub-commentator, Aghoraśiva appears to provide this quote to bolster the commentator's point, that there is a universal connection between an effect and its agent or cause, and that this relationship allows us to infer that the world's existence is due to the agency of Śiva. Hence, he argues that an effect (i.e., the world) necessarily has an agent or creator. The quote comes at the end of a long discussion and so, like the first quote, seems to serve as a concise, emphatic conclusion, rather than an authoritative claim. Still, the statement is problematic because it looks as though Aghoraśiva is citing himself as an authority. At best, we can say that the statement is ambiguous; but surely it is significant that the argument does not rest on the authority of Aghoraśiva's own words. In that sense, this quote from the *Pāṣaṇḍāpajaya*, as well as the first one, resemble another emphatic reference in the same sub-commentary. In his gloss on the characteristics of *pāśa* (fetters), Aghoraśiva affirms that fetters cannot be removed without the rites of initiation and states, "I have said this [before] and will say it again."[9]

In addition to making internal references to his own commentarial works, providing first-person references, and quoting authoritative works and his own in distinct ways, Aghoraśiva also refers to his ritual manual. In the *Ratnatrayollekhinī*, he explains, "Rudra's names are also the names of worlds (*bhuvanas*). And I have investigated and explained the *bhuvanas* and the like in my ritual manual (*paddhati*)."[10] But which *paddhati* does he mean ? Besides the *Kriyākramadyotikā*, along with the *Parārthanityapūjāvidhi* which is the main focus of this essay, Aghoraśiva

8. Paraphrase of Hulin, p. 118. End of Aghoraśiva's gloss on Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha's *vṛtti* on the *Mṛgendrāgama*, Vidyāpāda, Ch.3 (Patilakṣaṇaparīkṣāprakaraṇa), vv. 6b - 7ā.

9. Paraphrase of Hulin p. 178; Gloss on Ch. 7 (Pāśalakṣaṇa), v. 8.

10. *tatra rudranāmāny eva bhuvanānām api nāmāni bhuvanādayaś ca paddhatyām evāsmābhir vivicya darśitaḥ* | Gloss on vv. 91-2; *Aṣṭaprakaraṇam* p. 165.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

is said to have written a *Mṛgendrapaddhati.* Brunner reports that the only known manuscript of the latter work is incomplete, containing only the beginning portions of the text, from the morning rituals to the rites of initiation. However, included in the manuscript is a complete commentary by one of Aghoraśiva's students, who glosses not only the above mentioned portions of the work, but also the *ācāryābhiṣeka, vratoddhāra, antyeṣṭi,* and *pratiṣṭhā.*[11] The above mentioned reference to the *bhuvanas* - "Worlds" with a specific meaning in Śaiva Siddhāntin context - may point to this little-known ritual manual; moreover, for reasons too technical to explain here, the explanation of the *bhuvanas* would most likely appear in the rules for the initiation rites.[12]

The *bhuvanas* are not discussed in the *Parārthanityapūjāvidhi,* since the text provides the rules for daily temple rituals, not "occasional" rites like initiation. But the subject does appear in the rules for the "liberating initiation" (*nirvāṇadīkṣā*) in Aghoraśiva's *Kriyākramadyotikā* (hereafter *KKD*). This text, which comes down to us in both manuscript and published forms, includes instructions pertaining to daily duties and worship of Śiva, "occasional" rites like initiation rituals and funerals, and "optional" rites like festivals of the initiated Siddhāntins. There exists a valuable Sanskrit commentary by Nirmalamaṇi Deśika (16th cent. A.D. ?), which covers the daily and occasional rites, as well as a later commentary by the Śivādvaitin Kacchapeśvara Śivācārya. The *KKD* was published in Chidambaram in 1927 with Nirmalamaṇi's commentary; this edition contains the daily rites, the *pavitra* and *damana* rituals, rites of initiation, and funeral ceremonies.[13] More recently, the South Indian

---

11. Helene Brunner-Lachaux, trans., *Mṛgendrāgama : Section des rites et section du comportement,* Institut Francais d'Indologie Pondicherry, 1985, xxiii-xxiv. As she notes, N.R. Bhatt consulted this manuscript for his critical edition of the *Mṛgendrāgama* (*kriyāpāda et caryāpāda*), Institut Francais d'Indologie Pondicherry, 1962.

12. See Helene Brunner-Lachaux, trans., *Somaśambhupaddhati,* Vol.3, Institut Francais d'Indologie Pondicherry, 1977, vi, xxvii, especially xvi-xvii.

13. *Kriyākramadyotikā* (or *Aghoraśivapaddhati*) of Aghoraśiva with the commentary *(Prabhā)* of Nirmalamaṇi, ed. Polakam Sri Rama Sastri and Ambalava Navala Jnanasambandha Parasakti, Chidambaram, 1927.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Archaka Association (SIAA) has brought out the *KKD* in several separate volumes, many parts of which are poorly edited and contain numerous typographical errors. In addition to publishing in Sanskrit with Tamil translation the daily, initiation, and funeral rituals listed above for the Chidambaram edition, the SIAA publications by or attributed to Aghoraśiva include the *KKD*'s rules for festivals (*mahotsavavidhi*), instructions for installing Śivaliṅgas (*Śivapratiṣṭhā*) and Goddess images (*Devīpratiṣṭhā*), and the *Śaivaṣoḍaśaprakāśikā*, a work that provides guidelines for domestic rites of passage (*samskāras*), tailored specifically for initiated Siddhāntin-brahmins.

Much work remains to be done before we can say with assurance that some of these volumes are authentic compositions by the 12th century Aghoraśiva. However, evidence suggests that the *KKD* originally included even more material than the daily, ocasional, and optional rites already mentioned. For instance, the commentator Nirmalamaṇi refers to a section on the rites of installation (*pratiṣṭhā*) within the *KKD*; this section does not form part of the Chidambaram edition. In his gloss, Nirmalamaṇi explains that in the *pratiṣṭhā* section, the text will give a particular form of a *mantra* which he quotes in full.[14] The SIAA edition of the *Śivapratiṣṭhā*, which is attributed to Aghoraśiva, lists exactly the same *mantra* and so provides some evidence that the latter work forms of the *KKD*.[15] But again, further work must be done in order to establish the manual's exact contents.

The *KKD* colophons give us important information about Aghoraśiva, his lineage and writings. For example, the colophon at the end of the section on the daily rites tells us that the rules were "created by the *guru* known as Parameśvara [i.e., Aghoraśiva], who composed the

14. *pratiṣṭhāyām, "īśānas sarvavidyānām śaśinyai namaḥ" iti saśaktinyāsasyaiva vakṣyamāṇatvāt iṣṭaliṅgasyāpi tasyaiva śivāgameṣu vihitatvāc ca viśaktinyāsaprakāśanam asaṅgatam* || From Nirmalamaṇi's gloss on the *Aṣṭatrimśatkalānyāsa*, Nityakarma section, in the *Kriyākramadyotikā*, p.99.

15. Kacchapesvara Sivacharya, ed., *Śivapratiṣṭhāvidhi* of Aghoraśivācārya, South Indian Archaka Association, Madras, 1964, p.129.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Sarvavidyeśinī, a summary of the meanings of the *vidyāpādas* in the *Mataṅga* and other *śāstras*, and who composed the *svarūpa* of the *pavitra* ritual ..."[16] In contrast to Aghoraśiva's own first-person references discussed above, we cannot say who wrote this colophon - and there are many like it - because it refers to the author in the third person.

However, we do find some valuable first-hand information from Aghoraśiva in the *KKD*. First, at the end of the festival rules, the author provides the date of composition of his text: year 1080 of the Śaka era of the Kali Yuga, i.e., 1158 C.E. Second, Aghoraśiva claims authorship of the *KKD*. At the beginning of the rules for the daily rituals, he writes:

> Saluting all the *gurus* from Śiva to Ananta who have descended in the unbroken order of our teachers' lineage, I have composed the *Kriyākramadyotikā*, in order to clarify the daily and other rituals.[17]

Furthermore, at the end of the section on festivals, he adds:

> Having learned carefully in the presence of the best of my *gurus*, at the feet of Sarvātmaśiva, the daily and other rites, along with their religious meaning, the teachings established in the *Siddhāntasārapaddhati*, as well as the daily and occasional rites found in the *Uttuṅgaśivapaddhati* and established by the excellent *gurus* who preceded me, I have composed the *Kriyākramadyotikā*.[18]

---

16. *Kriyākramadyotikā*, p. 146. The *Sarvavidyeśinī* seems to be known only from this reference. The rules for the *pavitra* ritual follow daily worship (*nityakarma*) section of the *KKD*.

17. *Ibid.*, p.8
gurūn parāparān natvā guruvamśakramāgatān |
kriyākramadyotikeyam nityādeḥ kriyate sphuṭam ||

18. Wayne Surdam, "South Indian Śaiva Rites of Initiation: The *Dīkṣāvidhi* of Aghoraśivācārya's *Kriyākramadyotikā*" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1984), xviii-xix; *Mahotsavavidhi*, South Indian Archaka Association, Madras, 1974, p. 428. In another colophon at the end of the *nirvāṇadīkṣā*, Aghoraśiva acknowledges his debt to Bhojadeva and Induśiva (another name for Somaśambhu) : See *Kriyākramadyotikā* p.365.
dīkṣākramo 'yam gurubhir yathoktaś śrībhojadevenduśivādibhiś ca /
mantrakriyābhāvavibodhahetos tathā mayaivam racitas subodhaḥ ||

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

As we saw in his commentaries, he again refers to himself in the first-person in his *paddhati*; here, in addition, he directly identifies some of his written sources and one of his *gurus*. This kind of evidence is particularly valuable because it marks Aghoraśiva's own voice in a way that the other colophons which refer to the author in the third person, and often in laudatory terms - do not.[19]

To sum up this section, I have argued that many of Aghoraśiva's authentic writings can be verfied by internal references to his own texts, his use of quotesto refer to authoritative texts by others, and first-person claims of authorship and lineage. These elements provide the background against which we can judge the authenticity of the *Parāthanityapūjāvidhi*.

The *Parāthanityapūjāvidhi* (*PNPV*)

The *New Catalogus Catalogorum* observes that the *PNPV*, which provides a detailed account of daily temple worship (*parārthapūjā*), does not seem to form part of the *KKD*; nor, as far as I know, is it mentioned in any of Aghoraśiva's writings. The text, published in Devakoṭṭai in 1930 and edited by K.M. Subrahmanya Sastri, is divided into two parts.[20] The first details the Śivācārya's morning purifications and meditations, while the second explains the rules pertaining to the six daily *kālapūjās*, starting with the worship of the temple guardian (*kṣetrapāla*) and awakening of Śiva and the Goddess in their bed chamber, followed by the daily worship of Sūrya, Gaṇeśa, Śiva, Caṇḍa, Subrahmaṇya, the Goddess, and the cow. During the evening *pūjās*, Śiva is worshipped as Naṭeśa and Somāskanda; the *nāyanār* Sundaramūrti is also honoured at this time. At midnight, the *kṣetrapāla* is again

19. Third-person references to Aghoraśiva appear in most of the colophons of the *Kriyākramadyotikā*, e.g., p. 146 (end of *nityakarma* section), p. 165 (end of *pavitravidhi*), p. 198 (end of *damanavidhi*), and at the conclusion of all the other major sections of the text.

20. *Parārthanityapūjāvidhi* (or *Śivālayanityapūjāvidhi*) of Aghoraśivācārya, ed. K.M. Subrahmanya Sastri, Sivagama Siddhanta Paripalana Samgha, Devakottai, 1930.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

worshipped before the daily routine ends. In addition to describing the daily worship, the *PNPV* contains over fifty textual references and quotes. Out of twenty-one texts cited, most appear only or twice; only four texts are quoted more often, with sixteen citations from the *Kāraṇāgama*. R. Subramanian has provided a concise and useful summary of the text in Tamil.[21]

The *PNPV's* claim to authenticity rests in part on its two colophons. The first appears at the end of Part One, which focusses on the morning purifications and rites that the Ādi Śaiva priest must perform before commencing his temple duties :

> *iti aghoraśivācārya-viracita-parārthanityapūjāvidhau pūrvabhāgaḥ samāptaḥ.*[22]
>
> End of Part One in the 'Rules for Temple Worship',written by Aghoraśivācārya.

This colophon could have been written by a disciple and so affirms only that the *PNPV* is attributed to Aghoraśiva. The second colophon, at the end of the second half of the text, is more elaborate :

> *iti śrīmat parameśvara-aparanāmadheya-dvilakṣādhyāpaka-śrīmad ācāryavarya-aghoraśivācārya-viracitāyām sakalāgama-sāra-samgṛhītāyām*[23] *parārthanityapūjāpaddhatyām kṣetrapālapūjā-vidhiḥ samāptaḥ.*[24]
>
> Conclusion of the rules for *kṣetrapāla* worship in the *Parārthanityapūjāvidhi*, which is compiled of the essence of all the

---

21. R. Subramanian, "Parārtta pūjai", in *Śiva Temple and Temple Rituals*, ed. S.S. Janaki, The Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Madras, 1989, pp. 64-75.
22. *Parārthanityapūjāvidhi*, 12
23. The *New Catalogus Catalogorum* mentions that, according to the colophon of the *PNPV*, the work is based on the *Sakalāgamasārasamgraha*. This interpretation appears to be wrong, based perhaps on too hasty a reading of this colophon's phrase *'sakalāgamasārasamgṛhītāyām'*
24. *Parārthanityapūjāvidhi*, 127.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Āgamas and written by Aghoraśivācārya, also known as Parameśvara, teacher of dualism and best of preceptors.

But this statement too suffers from the lack of any first-person references that could reassure us that the *PNPV* is truly one of Aghoraśiva's own works. Both colophons are very similar in wording to several ones in the *KKD* as at the end of the section on the daily rites:

iti parameśvarāparanāmadheya-śrīmad aghoraśivācārya-viracitāyām kriyākramadyotikāyām nityakarma-vidhiḥ samāptaḥ.[25]

Conclusion of the rules for the daily rites in the *Kriyākramadyotikā*, written by Aghoraśivācārya, also known as Parameśvara.

Moreover, in the *KKD*'s *antyeṣṭi* rules, one of the colophons adds Aghoraśiva's epithet "teacher of dualism" (*dvilakṣādhyāpaka*), which appears in the second *PNPV* colophon.[26] However similar the *KKD*'s and the *PNPV's* colophons may be, we cannot know for certain who wrote the two *PNPV* colophns because they refer to the author in the third person. I have not been able to locate any first-person self-references or other autobiographical statements in the *PNPV*, or even any early external references to the text; without these, it is impossible to confirm the reliability of the colophons.

Now, when we turn to the contents of the *PNPV* text, we find many questionable features. For one, the liberal use of Vedic *mantras* makes us question the antiquity of the text. Even though *mantras* from the Vedas were included in the oldest Āgamas, they were reinterpreted

---

25. *Kriyākramadyotikā*, p. 147. Similar colophons appear at the end of other major sections of the work, e.g. pp. 165, 198, 365, 367, 372, 384, 387, 410, 413, etc.

26. *Ibid* ., p. 487. End of the section on the funeral rules :

iti parameśvarāparanāmadheya dvilakṣādhyāpaka-śrīmad aghoraśivācāryaviracitāyām kriyākramadyotikāyām antyeṣṭvidhis samāptaḥ //

Although the epithet *dvilakṣādhyāpaka* is sometimes translated as "teacher of two lakhs of students," I agree with Dvivedi's reading of this term as "teacher of dualism". See his Sanskrit introduction to the *Aṣṭaprakaraṇam*, p. 9 fn. 4.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

and re-contextualized for Śiva worship. In time, though, the distinction between Agamic and Vedic practices became somewhat blurred, leading to an abundance of Vedic *mantras* in contemporary Agamic rituals, as Surdam has documented.[27] In the *PNPV*, too, we see the generous use of Vedic or in Vedic style *mantras*, a feature absent from earlier texts. For instance, in the section on the preparation of *pādya*, *arghya*, and *ācamana* water, the *śivagāyatrī mantra* is used, along with obviously archaic verses, e.g., "*indram viśvā avīvṛnthsamudravyacasaṅgiraḥ rathītamam rathīnām vājānām satpatim patim*".[28] This evidence suggests a composition of relatively recent origin, much closer to the elaborate "Vedicized" *mantras* of a modern *paddhati* like the *Śivāgamaprayogacandrikā* than to the *mantras* used in the *KKD*.

Another questionable feature of the *PNPV* is that it provides two direct references to the *KKD*. First, in the section on the 38 *kalānyāsa*, we read :

> *yathā kriyākramadyotikāyām, sakalīkaraṇaprakāre — om hom īśānas sarvavidyānām śaśinyai namaḥ - ūrdhvamūrdhni.....*[29]
>
> As in the manner of the *sakalīkaraṇa* in the *Kriyākramadyotikā* — on the upraised head [of Sadāśiva, one should impose the *mantra*]: *om hom īśānas sarvavidyānām śaśinyai namaḥ* ....[30]

What is odd here is that the 38 *kalā mantras* given in the *PNPV* are not all the same as the ones listed in the *KKD*. For instance, "*bhrāmiṇī*" appears in the *PNPV* and "*bhāmaṇī*" in the *KKD*; but some are more significant: the *PNPV's* "*vāma*" as opposed to the *KKD's*

---

27. See Wayne Surdam, 'Vedicization of Śaiva Rituals', in *Śiva Temple and Temple Rituals*, ed. S.S. Janaki, The Kuppuswami Sastri Reşearch Institute, Madras, 1988 pp. 52-60.
28. *Parārthanityapūjāvidhi*, 26. Many similar Vedic or "Vedic-style" *mantras* are used in this section (*pādyārghyācamanīyavidhī*) and in the rules for preparing *pañcagavya*; see 25-9 etc.
29. *Ibid.*, *aṣṭatrimśatkalānyāsa*, 18—20.
30. *Ibid.*, 18

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

"*kāma*"[31] and a few are completely different : "*rakṣā*" as opposed to "*dayā*", "*nidrā*" as opposed to "*niṣṭā*". A broad comparison of different Agamic texts reveals many variants among the names of the 38 *kalās*. However, if Aghoraśiva was in fact the author of the *PNPV* it is unclear why he would first cite his own *KKD*, then list significant variants in the *PNPV*.[32] Of course, these variants may simply be textual corruptions. But it is equally possible that someone else wrote the *PNPV* and added the *KKD* reference on the basis of a manuscrpt that differs somewhat from the published text.

Moreover, in the rules for preparing sacred ash and applying it to the body (*bhasmadhāraṇa*) the *PNPV* provides a direct quote from the *KKD*. The *PNPV* begins this section with the words,

> *kalpam bhasma tu "samhitayābhimantrayet"/ akalpam tu nivṛttyādikalāmantraiḥ samśodhya samhitayā-abhimantrayet" iti kriyākramadyotikā.*[33]
>
> Regarding the best [kind of] sacred ash, the *Kriyākramadyotikā* [says], "One should recite the *samhitā mantras*. But one should purify inferior ash with the *nivṛtti* and other *kalā mantras*, [then] recite the *samhitā mantras*."
>
> Compare the above with the *KKD*:
>
> *yathā kalpādisiddham bhasma samādāya, 'samhitayābhimantrayet' / akalpam tu nivṛttyādikalāmantrais samśodhya, samhitayā ca-abhimantrya,...*[34]

---

31. See *Śivapratiṣṭhāvidhi* of Aghoraśivācārya, ed., Kaccapesvara Sivacharya, South Indian Archaka Association, Madras, 1964, pp. 128 - 32. A list of the 38 *kalā mantras* are also given in the section on the daily rites, but the commentator Ṇirmalamaṇi asserts that they are interpolations; see *Kriyākramadyotikā*, p. 99.
32. See N.R. Bhatt's list "Let noms des 38 *kalā* dans les textes," in *Rauravāgama* (*vidyāpāda et kriyāpāda*), Vol. 1, Institut Francais d'Indologie, Pondicherry, 1961, pp. 28-9.

    The *Parārthanityapūjāvidhi* is included in this list.
33. *Parārthanityapūjāvidhi*, 6.
34. *Kriyākramadyotikā* (*Āgneyasnānavidhi*) p. 20.

In Public domain. Digitization.Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Taking ash prepared according to the best method, one should recite the *samhitā mantras*. But one should purify inferior ash with the *nivṛtti* and other *kalā mantras*, and recite the *samhitā mantras*...

As asserted earlier, Aghoraśiva, like other authors, tends not to quote from his own works, at least not in an authoritative manner. But in contrast to the quotes from the *Pāṣaṇḍāpajaya* discussed in the first part of this essay, the *PNPV's* citation of the *KKD* here does seem to be more authoritative in tone : no other texts are cited nearby, nor is any qualifying information given that might help the reader distinguish between the authority of the *KKD*, on the one hand, and revered Āgamas and works by past masters on the other. True, the references might be interpolations. In favour of this view, one could point out that the *KKD* quote appears near the beginning of the rules for applying sacred ash; similarly, the other reference comes at the very beginning of the rules for the 38 *kalānyāsa*. These two referenses could have been added at a later date. However, unless one could compare several manuscripts of the *PNPV* this problem cannot be solved in a decisive manner.

But besides providing unhelpful colophons, 'Vedic-style' *mantras* and suspicious looking references to the *KKD*, the *PNPV* also describes temple worshop that in all respects closely resembles the rituals performed in big temples in Tamil Nadu today. For instance, Gaṇapati, Subrahmaṇya, and Gaurī all receive full *pūjās* of their own :

Subrahmaṇya receives worship along with Valli (also called Vanavalli or Vallīśvarī); and Gaurī's *pūjā* (which uses the *bīja mantra 'śrīm'* includes the worship of Caṇḍeśvarī.[35] In addition Sundaramūrti *nāyanār* who also has his own shrine (*bhaktadevālaya*), is worshipped along with his two Śaktis, and receives a *nirmālya* garland.[36] Caṇḍeśvara himself has been transformed from the earlier ferocious form of Śiva who alone may receive the *nirmālya*, to Caṇḍeśvara *nāyanār* who is

35. *Parārthanityapūjāvidhi*, 89, 99.

36. *Ibid.*, 118-19.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

described as a "great devotee" (*mahābhakta*); he is also called Dhvanicaṇḍa, as is the modern custom.[37] But the strongest clue that the *PNPV* is not an old text is that after the noon-worship, the priest "enters the *nirmālyamaṇṭapa* and distributes the *nirmālya* rice, etc., to pure brahmans and all others".[38] In the early Agamic and *paddhati* texts, food and other substances that had been offered to Śiva were considered to be too pure for human consumption, and thus dangerous. This practice changed over time, so that a portion of the *nirmālya* is now offered to Caṇḍeśvara, with the rest shared as *prasāda* among priest and lay worshippers alike.

Finally, the many references to architecture in the *PNPV* give us a picture of a large, fully developed temple complex with separate shrines for many of the subsidiary deities, along with specialised halls and chambers. The text traces the priest's movements from the shrine of the temple guardian (*kṣetrapālasannidhi*) to the sleeping chamber of the God and Goddess, then on to the main Śivaliṅga shrine, the *abhiṣeka* hall (*snapanamaṇḍapa*), and so on. Other references to fully developed temple architecture include the dance-hall (*nṛttamaṇḍapa*) and separate shrines for Śiva's 'footprints' (*pādukeśvarālaya*), Subrahmaṇya, Gaurī and Caṇḍeśvara, along with a shrine for Sundaramūrti (*bhaktālaya*). True, some of these structures, like the separate Goddess shrine, were developed as early as the eleventh century. For example, from the late eleventh to the early thirteenth centuries, the Naṭarāja temple at Chidambaram saw the construction of a separate Goddess temple, the thousand-pillared Rājasabhā, the Gaṇapati shrine attached to the outer side of the west *gopura*, and the separate Subrahmaṇya shrine.[39] However, the Bṛhadīśvara temple in Thanjavur was relatively uncluttered in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, with no separate temples for the

37. *Ibid.*, 87.

38. *Ibid.*, 102.

39. See Paul Younger, *The Home of Dancing Śivaṉ : Traditions of the Hindu Temple in Citamparam*, Oxford University, New York, 1995, pp. 98-104; also David Smith, "Chidambaram", in *Temple Towns of Tamil Nadu*, ed. George Michell, Marg Publications, Bombay, 1993, pp. 58-75.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Goddess, Gaṇapati, or Subrahmaṇya, as there are now; the latter shrine was not built until the Nayak period (17th - 18th centuries). The huge temple complex at Tiruvannamalai was also relatively modest in size during the Chola period.[40] Hence, many of the architectural features described in the *PNPV* point to the sort of large temple complex that is familiar to us only from the Vijayanagara period.

Why then is the *PNPV* attributed to Aghoraśivācārya ? It could be that the author's *dīkṣā* name happened to be Aghoraśiva; many initiates have names based on one of the five heads of Sadāśiva. Zvelebil, for instance, gives us a few clues about other Aghoraśivas, like a sixteenth - century Śaivite whom he cites as 'the author of *Akorapattati*' and 'the teacher of Ativīrarāma Pāṇḍya'.[41] Unfortunately, I have not been able to find any further information about this figure. Then again, the *PNPV* author or someone else might have put Aghoraśiva's name on the work in order to give it an air of antiquity and authority or to round out Aghoraśiva's *oeuvre* so that it would seem to cover all Agamic rites. After all, in the nineteenth century one Sadyojāta Śivācārya authored a ritual manual that he entitles the *Kriyākramadyoti*; Brunner has dubbed this work a fake.[42]

However, by casting doubt upon the authorship of the *Parārthanityapūjāvidhi*, I do not mean to diminish the value of the work as a useful guide for modern temple worship, especially since at least some temple priests apparently consult it. It could well be that some of them recite equally from the *PNPV* and the *KKD*, believing both to be works by one and the same Aghoraśivācārya. According to Diehl, the

40. See Pierre Pichard and Francoise L'Hernault, 'Le temple d'Aruṇācaleśvara: Construction,' in *Tiruvaṇṇāmalai: un lieu saint śivaite du sud de l'inde*, Vol. 2, ed. Francoise L'Hernault, Pierre Pichard, Jean Deloche, Ecole Francaise d'Extreme Orient, Paris, 1990, pp. 75-96.

41. Kamil Zvelebil, *Tamil Literature*, E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1975, p.245, fn. 53. In the same place, he also mentions a seventeenth-century Akōramuṇivar (also called Akōratampirāṉ), author of several Tamil *purāṇas*.

42. Helene Brunner, review of *Nityasumaṅgalī : Devadasi Tradition in South India*, by Saskia C. Kersenboom-Story, in *Indo-Iranian Journal* 33 (1990), p. 131.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

PNPV "is referred to by the Paṭṭar of the Mīnākṣī temple at Mathurai and by Śrī Devasigamani Paṭṭar of the Comanāta temple at Mānamathurai ... as building on the *Kāraṇākamam* and of authoritaive value."[43] Certainly Diehl himself found the work to be valuable for understanding modern temple ritual.[44]

In short, although it seems that priests and scholars have assumed that Aghoraśivācārya composed both the *KKD* and *PNPV* there are compelling reasons to believe that the latter is a relatively recent work and not an authentic composition by the twelfth century master. To the credit of the *PNPV* author, however, his rules for daily temple rituals are detailed and accurate enough to constitute a useful guide for modern temple priests and scholars.

---

43. Carl Gustav Diehl, *Instrument and Purpose: Studies on Rites and Rituals in South India*, C.W.K. Gleerup Lund., 1956, p. 98.

44. Diehl's work above relies heavily on the *Parārthanityapūjāvidhi*, e.g., pp. 55-7, 67-82, 95-146, 157.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy